

Remarks/Arguments

Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner reconsider the Application in view of the remarks below.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 remain pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bratz (US2002/0120728 A1) in view of Tagami (US 4,484,284). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Applicant previously noted, in the paper dated August 12, 2004, that the invention of this Application monitors and records many different types of trip data (e.g., speed, fuel consumption and engine revolutions per minute, Application Summary) on the occurrence of many different types of predetermined trip events (e.g., speed and engine revolutions per minute thresholds). These different types of trip data are not used to determine geographic position but are valuable in their own right. Tagami, on the other hand, discloses the monitoring and recording of one, and only one, type of trip data ("current azimuthal deviation," Abstract) on the occurrence of one, and only one, type of predetermined trip event "unit distance of travel," (column 4, line 40). This specific type of trip data is used only for determining geographic position.

More specifically, the present invention also graphically displays many different types of trip data recorded on the occurrence of one of many different types of predetermined trip events. Tagami, on the other hand, geographically displays only the geographic position over time of the vehicle (column 5, lines 3-18) or, at most, additional information derived from the geographic position over time of the vehicle (time of travel or total distance traveled) (column 5, lines 19-31).

The Office Action of January 12, 2005 (the "Office Action") noted that "Applicant's arguments filed 12/1/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive." More specifically, the Office Action noted,

“Applicant fails to claim many different types of trip data are monitoring and recording based on the occurrence of many different types of predetermined trip events.” Office Action at page 6.

In response, claim 1 is herein amended to refer to “multiple types of trip data...” and to “multiple predetermined trip events.”

The Office Action also noted,

“...Applicant fails to claim the trip data is unrelated to geographic position.”

In response, claim 1 is herein amended to refer to “...trip data not used to determine geographic position.”

Applicant, in conjunction with the amendments to claim 1 made herein, respectfully again makes the arguments contained in the paper of August 12, 2004, and repeated above.

Claims 2-3 and 6-8 are rejected as being unpatentable over Bratz in view of Tagami for additional reasons cited in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Applicant respectfully submits claims 2-3 and 6-8, which are dependent on claim 1, are allowable as claims dependent on an allowable independent claim are also allowable.


Conclusion

The claims have been shown to be allowable over the prior art. Applicant believes that this paper is responsive to the grounds of rejection cited by the Examiner in the Action dated January 12, 2005, and respectfully requests favorable action in this Application. The examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 04-0932 (Reference Number 11621/53970).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 8, 2005

By: 
Paul C. Remus, Reg. No. 37,221

DEVINE, MILLIMET & BRANCH, P.A.
111 Amherst Street
P.O. Box 719
Manchester, NH 03105

Telephone: (603) 669-1000
Facsimile: (603) 669-8547